



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,840	10/30/2003	Rainer Weisbrodt	WSP219US	9134

7590 12/15/2004

Simpson & Simpson PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221

EXAMINER


PICKARD, ALISON K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3676

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/696,840	Applicant(s) WEISBRODT ET AL.	
	Examiner Alison K. Pickard	Art Unit 3676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not disclose an embodiment where the protective layer and stiffening ring are a single piece of metal. In fact, the specification discloses that when metal is used for the stiffening ring, the protective layer is PTFE.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reid (2,859,061).

Reid discloses a sealing ring having an elastically deformable base ring 2 and a one-piece protective layer and stiffening ring 3 made of PTFE. As seen in Figures 3-6, the stiffening ring is provided at either the inner or outer edge of the base ring and has a height less than the greatest

Art Unit: 3676

height of the base ring. The stiffening ring has a greater firmness than the base (col. 4, lines 37-38).

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheesley (3,531,133).

Sheesley discloses a sealing ring having an elastically deformable base ring 23 and a stiffening ring 21 or 22 at either an inner or outer circumferential edge of the base ring. The stiffening rings are firmer than the base ring and made of metal or plastic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheesley.

Sheesley does not disclose that the stiffening ring is made of stainless steel. This is a design choice. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use is not considered inventive. See *In re Leshin* 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the stiffening ring from stainless steel.

8. Claims 5-7, 9-11, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheesley in view of Hobson (2,580,546).

Sheesley does not disclose a protective layer over the base ring. Hobson teaches using a protective layer of PTFE over a deformable base ring of a sealing ring to provide chemical and

Art Unit: 3676

thermal resistance. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ring of Sheesley with the protective layer taught by Hobson to provide the seal with chemical and thermal resistance.

9. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheesley as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Hobson.

Sheesley does not disclose a protective layer over the base ring. Hobson teaches using a protective layer of PTFE over a deformable base ring of a sealing ring to provide chemical and thermal resistance. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ring of Sheesley with the protective layer taught by Hobson to provide the seal with chemical and thermal resistance.

10. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reid.

Reid does not disclose that the one-piece protective layer and stiffening ring is metal, i.e. stainless steel. Using this material is considered a design choice. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use is not considered inventive. See *In re Leshin* 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960). Further, it is known that a sealing ring with a deformable base ring can be covered in a metal as evidenced by Wiener '852. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the protective layer/stiffening ring from metal, such as stainless steel as a matter of choice in design.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Art Unit: 3676

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alison K. Pickard whose telephone number is 703-305-0882.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30), with alternate Friday's off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Alison K. Pickard
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3676

AP